

Q L
G587L
1826

25/ *(D.)* *L*
A Letter

John Buckler

TO

DR. THOMAS P. JONES,

EDITOR OF THE FRANKLIN JOURNAL.

BY JOHN D. GODMAN, M. D.

"FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS."

70107

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1826.

33.
all

QL

G587L

1826

40

TO

DR. THOMAS P. JONES,

EDITOR OF THE FRANKLIN JOURNAL.

——— “ Oftentimes, excusing of a fault,
Doth make the *fault* worse by TH’EXCUSE :
As patches set upon a little breach
Discredit more in hiding of the fault,
Than did the fault before it was so patched.”
SHAKSPEARE: *King John*.

DEAR SIR,

As I understood before publishing my “*Note on an article in the North American Review*,” in your first number, that your paper was subscribed for by a very large number of scientific and literary individuals, and was, moreover, intended to be a SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL, it has amused me to find that Dr. RICHARD W. HARLAN, with peculiar modesty, has stated in a pamphlet recently published, that your work is *not scientific*, and, by consequence, your readers not proper judges of scientific subjects. Yet, notwithstanding this, he has taken great pains to furnish your readers with his pamphlet, entitled “*Refutation of certain Misrepresentations issued against the Author of the ‘Fauna Americana,’*” and would fain have this “Refutation” received as a “plain and candid” as well as a *scientific* production !

In your first number I published a note, making known one of the most singular attempts

which has yet occurred in this country, to impose on the public *translated* for original matter. In consequence of that note, the author of the Fauna has appealed to the public, and, giving loose to the violence of his passion, has plunged still deeper in the offence of which he was accused, by a more deliberate and sustained attempt to deceive. His harsh speeches, abuse, and dark insinuations, are unworthy the notice of any upright man; more especially when proceeding from a person who stands in the predicament in which we shall now prove him to be placed.

That "truth is great and will prevail" is not more certain, than that he who writes under the influence of passion is more apt to injure than to benefit his cause. The matter in question, however, is not how much Dr. HARLAN can outstep the bounds of decorum, or the dignified deportment which is characteristic of justice and truth. It is with the public that he has a heavy account to settle, for delinquencies heretofore but little known in this country. If it were in his power to blacken the robes of the angels of light, it would not remove from his own vestments, one atom of their stain.

Before making a more full and formal statement of the extent to which the plagiarism of Dr. Harlan has been carried, I beg leave to premise, that I did *not*, as he would have it understood, publish my first statement of his conduct from motives of *personal* pique. That Dr. Harlan's anger was excited a long time ago, is most true; and this was in consequence

of my discharging a duty, as one of a committee of the Academy of Natural Sciences, which placed the fairness of Dr. Harlan in a very ambiguous light, and inspired many others, besides myself, with deep disgust at his disingenuous conduct. But so far from hastening to do him an injury, although I had the facts now to be proved, then in my possession and was repeatedly urged to make them public, it was not done; because I was engaged in preparing a work on the same subject, and did not wish to be charged with the desire of injuring the reputation of any man:—a feeling which I never have experienced, and assuredly I could not be under its influence as regards one, who never did, nor can injure mine. To those who urged me to publish the facts, I uniformly replied, that so long as no notice was taken of the book in this country, I should remain silent; but, as soon as any one treated it as an *original* work, the facts should be stated, and the proofs adduced.

My first statement was made as an act of justice to the cause of science, and of duty to the public: the present letter is dictated by a similar feeling, and shall be directed towards the same end; without reference to any of the asperities of language or indecorous assertions which are so abundantly scattered by Dr. Harlan in his "*Refutation*." Nothing that is here said is directed to HIM. He stands charged with an unjustifiable, and, in this country, an unprecedented *plagiarism*, or the appropriation of the intellectual property of another to his own use. He has not only done this, but has come for-

ward to justify his conduct, and place himself under public protection as an ill-treated and injured man. Finally he criminales all within his reach, to show that he is not singular in his want of judgment, nor standing alone in disrespect for that sacred law of right, which considers the infringement of the literary property of another as dishonest.

The proofs of this statement are immediately to follow, and although it is a disagreeable office to act in such a case, yet, in this, as in all other instances where connivance at incorrect conduct is an injury to the character and well-being of society, the unpleasant duty should be unshrinkingly discharged. The individual is to me nothing; his success could not in the least interfere with mine; his degradation can in no possible way yield me satisfaction or service.

In the first page of his introduction, Dr. Harlan makes the following remarks:

“A work having for its object the illustration of the natural history of our country, cannot fail to prove interesting, and has long been a desideratum to naturalists. However unqualified for the task, I have nevertheless found *ample room for additions, alterations and improvements*. On the *utility* of the undertaking it will be unnecessary to insist, when, on referring to the latest authorities who have treated of this subject, we are struck with the *confusion*, the *errors* and the *deficiencies* which prevail. In the very latest work, Desmarest’s *Mammalogie*, published in the year 1820, which professes to describe all the species of *Mammalia*, hitherto known, the number inhabiting North America is limited to one hundred *species*. Of these many are described as uncertain, and *his accounts of the manners and habits of most of them, are at best deficient*.”—*Fauna Am.*

Would not every man infer from this, that Dr. Harlan had made improvements; that he

would supply those deficiencies; and study from nature the habits and manners of the animals of his own country? Would any one suppose it possible, after such observations as the above, that Dr. Harlan would be content *to copy* from this same DESMAREST, those very habits and manners, just as they stand in the original—and that too without acknowledgment? Could you, Sir, have imagined such a thing? Yet, *you have seen it*; and *all* may see it who will refer to the work of DESMAREST.

In my note on the article in the North American Review, (which was intended to show cause why the “Fauna Americana” should *not* have been reviewed as an *original* work—not to review it,) I gave Dr. Harlan full credit for ALL he *acknowledged*, after stating the probable amount of his plagiarism. In his “Refutation,” after declaring the charge to be “false,” “gratuitous,” “a wilful misrepresentation,” &c. he says: *Ref.* page 8.

“In the above extract, he offers an UNWARRANTABLE contradiction to the PLAIN and CANDID statement we have made in our introduction to the “Fauna” (vid. p. 4, note) to the following effect:

“Mr. Desmarest, in his advertisement to the second part of his “Mammalogie,” p. 7, *limits* the number of mammalia inhabiting North America to *fifty-four* species: as this statement does not *in any degree* correspond with his descriptions, we presume he has *permitted a typographical error* OF GREAT IMPORTANCE, to escape his notice. We have *enumerated* from his work one hundred species, as inhabiting North America; the *descriptions* of *about fifty* of these having been found very accurate, are accordingly translated with very little alteration.”

The “*candid* statement,” in the note above quoted from the preface, is entirely opposite to

fact, besides being injuriously incorrect relative to Mr. Desmarest. The following are the words of the original :

“ Relativement à leur distribution sur le Globe, les mammifères peuvent être ainsi partagés : 54 dans l’Amérique Septentrionale : 10 *communs aux deux continens de l’Asie et de l’Amérique* : 41 propres à l’Asie septentrionale : 88 à l’Europe ; 107 à l’Afrique, 29 à l’île de Madagascar, et à celle de Mascareigne : 78 à l’Afrique Meridionale et à Ceylan : 51 aux îles de l’Archipel Indien : 33 à la Nouvelle Hollande et la Terre de Van Diemen. *Trente Cétacés, ou Phoques habitent les mers du Nord*, 14 celles du Sud, et à peu près 28 se trouvent dans les latitudes moyennes.”

(*Mammalogie, partie 2de. Avertissement, p .vii.*)

His reason for leaving out the parts of the paragraph italicised, will be obvious enough to the members of the Philosophical Society, who recollect what occurred on this subject between another member and Dr. Harlan. He had a particular interest at the time of publishing his book to lessen the number given by the French author. In this paragraph, (inserted entire,) Desmarest has most explicitly and fairly stated, that North America has FIFTY FOUR species, peculiarly her own, and TEN others which are found in Asia, as well as in North America ; besides which, there are THIRTY cetaceous animals and seals found in the northern seas, of which Dr. Harlan has *translated* from Desmarest, TWENTY Cetacea, six Seals, and ONE Morse, making the whole amount of American species NINETY ONE !! as given in the above quoted sentence, by the maltreated French naturalist. Yet with this before his eyes, he had at first, the hardihood, not only to misrepresent Desmarest, but even to charge him

with allowing "a *typographical error of great importance* to escape his notice," and to repeat this charge in his recent pamphlet as a plain and candid statement!! This is the author of the "Fauna Americana," who talks of being "calumniated," and of "*wilful misrepresentations*," and "*false*" and "*gratuitous assertions*!"

In his "Refutation," page 8, immediately after the note quoted from the preface to the "Fauna," Dr. Harlan has the following unparalleled attack upon common decency and common sense:

"Having thus given credit to Desmarest for FIFTY SPECIES, WE HONESTLY THOUGHT that we had attributed to him MORE than was justly his due"!!

This could scarcely have been anticipated, even from DR. HARLAN, if no more than fifty species had been copied; look at the logic of it, supposing but fifty had been borrowed:—a man borrows fifty dollars from another—he acknowledges it by note of hand,—he pays back fifty; no more; and then "*honestly*" thinks he has "attributed to him MORE than was justly his due"!!—As a naturalist, this author is exceedingly fond of establishing and naming *new species*; here is a *new species* of HONESTY doubly his, by right of discovery and by being exemplified in himself: one too, for the honour of which no one will be likely to contend with him. We would, therefore, suggest the propriety of calling it "HONESTAS HARLANICA," and let its "*essential characters*" be found in the above "*acknowledgment*."

But, Mr. Editor, can you inform us, by what magic the *characters of the orders*; of the

families; tribes, and genera, to say nothing of the essential characters, (which Dr. Harlan always translates "characters essential,") synonymy and habitudes of the animals, verbally and servilely translated from Desmarest, are to be brought within this acknowledgment of "fifty species"? Can you show me in what way the acknowledgment of "the descriptions of fifty species" can be made to signify the greater part of the whole volume entitled "Fauna Americana"? For my own part, I am utterly at a loss to see how it can be so significant, unless it be possible that a receipt for "fifty" could be considered a receipt for five thousand pounds.

"If copying from any author *the descriptions* of such species as have been well known, and accurately described since the days of Linnæus, can be construed into plagiarism, then *all* modern naturalists are plagiarists." *Ref.* page 9.

Is this statement true?—if it be true, will any man pretend that the great naturalists succeeding Linnæus, have *copied* Linnæus, in the sense which Dr. Harlan *has copied* Desmarest? The books themselves may answer. Has Illiger thus copied Linnæus?—as Cuvier copied Illiger?—Has Desmarest copied Cuvier? No. If they have copied "species" they have not *transcribed* ALL the characters of the *orders, families, tribes, and genera*, word for word, letter by letter. It was left for "RICHARD W. HARLAN, M. D." to do this, and then to attempt to sustain himself on that poor bundle of reeds, the acknowledgment of the "descriptions of about fifty species"!!

But not content with this utterly untenable position, and as if struck by a sort of 'judicial

blindness,' he utters the following words after the quotation last given: page 10.

"If such a construction be admissible, what must necessarily be the fate of that beautiful volume recently published by Mr. C. Bonaparte, (*"American Ornithology,"*) which contains the description of but one single species of bird not previously *known, named and described*. Yet, our "technical critic" does not hesitate, on all occasions "to elevate to the rank of an *original work*," this production of his patron."

Does he not imply by this, that Mr. Charles Bonaparte has *copied* those species of Birds which were "*previously known, named, and described*"? Is it not evident that such an inference is what he *wishes* to be drawn, and thus to insinuate that *he* has done no more? What is the fact? *The descriptions* in CHARLES BONAPARTE'S truly splendid and valuable "*American Ornithology*," of previously known species, are more entirely *original* than any which have ever yet been published, with the exception of those by WILSON; and they are *as original* as his. There is not a description of a bird, in the book above named, that is not wholly and solely drawn up from observing the birds themselves without reference to any previous *descriptions*, except in cases where previous descriptions are quoted in comparing species together. So much for this additional attempt to wrong another man of the fruits of his intellect and industry.

"We confess that we never enumerated the precise number of *pages* occupied in the '*Fauna*,' by the descriptions of the *fifty species* attributed to Desmarest, nor do we possess the means at present of obtaining accurate information on that subject, supposing it in the least important; but as the whole number of *species* described in the '*Fauna*,'

amounts to rather more than one hundred and fifty, occupying three hundred and fourteen pages, by the fairest mathematical computation, *the fifty species attributed to Desmarest cannot occupy more than one third, that is to say, one hundred pages, in place of two hundred and fifty, agreeably to the unqualified assertion of Dr. G.*" *Ref.* page 10.

By this limping and inadequate confession this "*Refuter*" still endeavours to throw dust into the eyes of those who read his defence, and again would centre the whole matter upon the "fifty species." He states he has no copy of Desmarest to refer to; I, fortunately, have one; and, moreover, it shall be at the service of all citizens of Philadelphia who read French, and feel interested to know the truth of this matter: it shall be accompanied by a marked copy of the "*Fauna*," referring to every passage in Desmarest copied without an *acknowledgment*.

The WHOLE of the matter contained under the following heads, (with the exception, in some cases, of "*Dental Formulæ*," copied from F. Cuvier,) is literally and servilely translated from Desmarest's "*Mammalogie*," and introduced into the "*FAUNA AMERICANA*" without the slightest acknowledgment, expressed or implied, either in the *Fauna* or in the pamphlet entitled "*Refutation*," &c. but is offered as ORIGINAL. "By RICHARD W. HARLAN, M. D." &c. &c.

| Fauna Americana. | | Beginning | Ending | From Desmarest. | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------|--------|-----------------|-----|
| ORDER Carnivora; and Genus | | | | | |
| Rhinopoma, | - | p. 15 | p. 17 | p. 107 | |
| Genus Vespertilio, (and Genus | | | | | |
| Taphozous, p. 22.) | - | 17 | 19 | 120 | 132 |
| FAMILY Insectivora, | - | 24 | 25 | 149 | |
| Genus Scalops | - | 30 | 32 | 155 | |
| Condylura, | - | 34 | 36 | 157 | |
| Talpa, | - | 41 | 42 | 159 | |

| Fauna Americana. | | Beginning | Ending | From Desmarest. |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|
| FAM. Carnivora and Genus | Ursus, | 45 | 46 | 163 |
| Genus | Procyon, | - 53 | 54 | 167 |
| | Taxus, | - 56 | 57 | 172 |
| | Gulo, | - 59 | 59 | 174 |
| | Mustela, | - 61 | 61 | 176 |
| | Mephitis, | - 68 | 69 | 184 |
| | Lutra, | - 70 | 71 | 187 |
| | Canis, | - 74 | 76 | 190 |
| | Felis, | - 93 | 94 | 216 |
| TRIBE, Carnivorous amphi- | | | | |
| bia and genus | Phoca, | 102 | 105 | 237-38 |
| Genus | Trichecus, | - 113 | 114 | 253 |
| FAMILY Marsupialia, | | 116 | 116 | 254 |
| Genus | Didelphis, | - 116 | 118 | 254-5 |
| ORDER Glires, | | 121 | 121 | 277 |
| Genus | Castor, | - 122 | 122 | 277 |
| | Fiber, | - 131 | 132 | 279 |
| | Arvicola, | - 134 | 134 | 280 |
| | Lemmus, | - 145 | 146 | 286-87 |
| | Mus, | - 147 | 148 | 297-98 |
| | Gerbillus, | - 155 | 155 | 319 |
| | Arctomys, | - 157 | 158 | 326 |
| | Sciurus, | - 172 | 173 | 330 |
| | Pteromys, | - 186 | 187 | 341 |
| Genus | Hystrix, | - 189 | 190 | 344 |
| | Lepus, | - 192 | 193 | 346 |
| ORDER, Edentata and Genus | | | | |
| | Megatherium, | - 199 | 200 | 362-65 |
| | Pachydermata, FA- | | | |
| MILY Proboscidea and Ge- | | | | |
| nus | Elephas, | - 203 | 207 | 381-82 |
| Genus | Mastodon, | - 210 | 210 | 384* |
| 2d FAMILY Pachydermata, &c. | | 217 | 218 | 389 |
| GENUS "Pecari or Dicotyles," | | 219 | 220 | 393 |
| | Tapirus, | - 222 | 223 | 409 |
| ORDER, Pecora and Genus | | | | |
| | Cervus, | - 226 | 229 | 422-29-30 |
| Genus | Antilope, | - 248 | 249 | 450-51 |
| | Capra, | - 252 | 253 | 480 |
| | Ovis, | - 258 | 259 | 486 |
| | Ovibos, | - 264 | 264 | 492 |
| | Bos, | - 267 | 268 | 496 |

* Beginning at " molars rectangular."

| Fauna Americana. | | Beginning | Ending | From Desmarest. |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------|--------|-----------------|
| ORDER, Ceta—FAM Cetacea | | | | |
| herbivora. Genus Manatus, | | 274 | 277 | 506-7 |
| Genus Rytina, - | - | 278 | 279 | 510 |
| FAMILY, Ceta; Genus Delphi- | | | | |
| nus, Subgenus Delphynor- | | | | |
| hynchus, - | - | 281 | 283 | 511-12 |
| Genus Monodon, | - | 289 | 290 | 522 |
| Cachalot, | - | 292 | 293 | 524 |
| Balæna, | - | 295 | 296 | 526-27 |

The following “*fifty species*,” taken from Desmarest, occur in the *Fauna Americana* between the 1st and 149th pages. These may be considered as the species which are acknowledged to have been copied :

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Rhinopoma Carolinien- | 25. C. Fulvus. |
| sis. | 26. C. Cinereo-argenteus. |
| 2. Vespertilio Carolinien- | 27. C. Lagopus. |
| sis. | 28. Felis Concolor. |
| 3. Sorex constrictus. | 29. F. Onca. |
| 4. S. Araneus. | 30. F. Pardalis. |
| 5. Scalops Canadensis. | 31. F. Canadensis. |
| 6. Condylura Cristata. | 32. F. Rufa. |
| 7. C. Longicaudata. | 33. F. Fasciata. |
| 8. Talpa Europea. | 34. F. Montana. |
| 9. Ursus Arctos. | 35. F. Aurea. |
| 10. U. Americanus. | 36. Phoca Cristata. |
| 11. U. Maritimus. | 37. P. Vitulina. |
| 12. Procyon Lotor. | 38. P. Groenlandica. |
| 13. Gulo Arcticus. | 39. P. Fetida. |
| 14. M. Vison. | 40. P. Barbata. |
| 15. M. Martes. | 41. Otaria Ursina. |
| 16. M. Canadensis. | 42. Trichecus Rosmarus. |
| 17. Lutra Brasiliensis. | 43. Didelphis Virginiana. |
| 18. L. Marina. | 44. Castor fiber. |
| 19. Canis Lupus. | 45. Fiber Zibethicus. |
| 20. C. Lycaon. | 46. Arvicola amphibius. |
| 21. C. Vulpes. | 47. Lemmus Hudsonius. |
| 22. C. Argentatus. | 48. Mus Rattus. |
| 23. C. Decussatus. | 49. Mus Sylvaticus. |
| 24. C. Virginianus. | 50. Arctomys Monax. |

The following FORTY FOUR SPECIES, occurring between the 150th and 301st page of the *Fauna Americana*, are taken verbally from Desmarest (with the exceptions specified) without any acknowledgment :

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Arctomys Empetra. | 11. Megatherium Cuvieri. |
| 2. Sciurus Cinereus. | 12. Megalonyx Jeffersonii. |
| 3. S. Capistratus. | 13. Elephas Primogenius.† |
| 4. S. Niger.* | 14. Mastodon Angustilens. |
| 5. S. Hudsonius. | 15. Sus Scrofa.§ |
| 6. P. Striatus. | 16. Dicotyles Torquatus. |
| 7. S. Hudsonius. | 17. Cervus Alces. |
| 8. Pteromys Volucella. | 18. C. Tarandus. |
| 9. Hystrix dorsata.† | 19. C. Canadensis.¶ |
| 10. Lepus Americanus. | 20. C. Virginianus.** |

* The concluding paragraph of the article on this squirrel, has the appearance of being intended for *original* matter, and consists of scientific discriminations. It is merely a verbal transfer of Desmarest's foot note (marked (1.) right side of page 334) to the text of the Fauna.

† Ending with the description.

‡ Two paragraphs of this article are *original*; beginning with the word "LOCALITY," page 208, and ending at "Rhinoceros," second line of page 209.

§ Ending at "beneath the eyes."

|| Three sentences of the article on this species are *original*, beginning at "when attacked by the panther," &c. page 221, and ending with the article, page 222, fourth line from the top.

¶ Five paragraphs and two sentences of this article, making about half a page are *original*; (that is, not copied from Desmarest.) Beginning at "*cervus major*, Ord," &c.—down to "same species," page 236. The sentences are, "cast their horns, for the most part, in the month of March, the leanest Elk retain their horns the longest," and "a fine specimen," &c. at the end of the article.

** The only *original* sentence in this article, is the following, page 239, "Weight from 90 to 100 lbs." From the beginning of this article, page 238, to the middle of page 241, ending at "extensive range," is, without acknowledgment, verbally from Desmarest: the whole of the rest of the article, extending to two-thirds of page 243, is quoted from SAY, as acknowledged.

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 21. Antilope Americana. | 33. Monodon Monoceros. |
| 22. Ovis Ammon.* | 34. M. Microcephalus. |
| 23. Ovibos Moschatus. | 35. M. Andersonianus. |
| 24. Bos Americanus. | 36. Physter Microcephalus. |
| 25. Stellerus Borealis. | 37. P. Trumpo. |
| 26. Delphinus Delphis. | 38. Balæna Mysticetus. |
| 27. D. Coronatus. | 39. B. Glacialis. |
| 28. D. Canadensis. | 40. B. Nodosa. |
| 29. D. Gradiator. | 41. B. Gibbosa. |
| 30. D. Grampus. | 42. B. Gibbar. |
| 31. D. Leucas. | 43. B. Boops. |
| 32. D. Anarnachus. | 44. B. Rostrata. |

The following species are acknowledged to be copied from SAY; they are inserted to aid the reader in estimating the full amount of Dr. Harlan's *originality*:

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Vespertilio Pruinosus. | 9 Arctomys Lindoviciana. |
| 2 V. Arquatus. | 10 Sciurus Magnicaudatus. |
| 3 Sorex Parvus. | 11 S. Quadrivittatus. |
| 4 S. Brevicaudus. | 12 S. Lateralis. |
| 5 Canis Latrans. | 13 S. Grammurus. |
| 6 C. Nubilus. | 14 Cervus Virginianus.† |
| 7 C. Velox. | 15. C. Macrodis. |
| 8 Pseudostoma Bursarius. | |

The following are from SABINE:

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 Arctomys Franklinii. | 3 Lepus Glacialis.‡ |
| 2 A. Richardsonii. | |

The Arctomys Parryii, is from Richardson.

A few days after the publication in the first number of the Franklin Journal, a friend convinced me that I was mistaken in relation to "Bonnaterre's Cetologie," which is not a *distinct work*, but forms an article in the "*Encyclo-*

* The greater part of the synonymy, and the whole of the "essential character."

† Beginning from page 241; ending 245.

‡ Excepting the two last paragraphs which are from Desmarest, and *unacknowledged*.

pedie Methodique," and had been for some time in this city. I was in error as to its *not* being in Philadelphia. Nevertheless, it is true, that although Dr. Harlan had the *opportunity* of quoting *the original*, yet has he been content to transcribe *Desmarest's* citations of *Bonna-terre*, as if he had never seen the work of the latter.

But Dr. Harlan has had recourse to another uncommon and disingenuous manœuvre in relation to *Desmarest*; which is, that of frequently transferring *Desmarest's* scientific, critical, marginal, and foot notes, into the text of the "*Fauna*," as *original* matter, in such a manner as to deceive any one who has not the French book before him; and what is worse, even those which relate to such authors as *Catesby* and *Bartram*, and as to facts which have occurred in *this* state. For proof of this refer to, and compare his "NOTE," page 172, with *Desmarest's* "*nota*," page 336; his observations, contained in the two last paragraphs of the article "*sciurus niger*," and *Desmarest's* foot-note, (1.) page 334; *his* facts relative to the gray squirrel, pages 174-5, and *Desmarest's*, page 332: as well as various others, which will be seen in the marked copy of the "*Fauna*." After having made this comparison, the reader, in admiration of the ingenuity displayed, will be tempted to exclaim, "Oh, shame! where is thy blush?" How he is to bring this *ingenuity* ("*NEW SPECIES*"?) under his acknowledgment of the "descriptions of fifty species,"

he may settle with the public, by "*mathematical computation*"—if he can.

He talks much and loudly of the number of species he has *established*;—If to *assert* be to *establish*, he has *just as solidly* thus established, that the "Brown Bear," (*U. Arctos*,) the European Mole,* (*Talpa Europea*,) the *Rhinopoma Caroliniensis* of Geoff. the common Eu-

* The authority upon which this genus was introduced into North America, is not a little laughable. In the Museum, the European specimens have their numbers placed within a *red* square: these specimens having been frequently removed for the sake of cleaning, &c. a European Mole was inadvertently placed behind a label having no *red* mark. On this authority, together with the asseition of the Museum profile-cutter, who depended on the same infallible guide, this European Mole was introduced as a North American animal, and figures as such in the "Fauna." In his synonymy of the species, the author supports himself, by quoting "*Talpa Americana*, black mole, Bartram's manuscript notes," which is not of the slightest avail, because the genus *Scalops* was not established when Bartram wrote; granting, however, that it had been, there is no proof that the *Talpa Americana* above stated, is the European Mole.

This is not the only instance in which the local knowledge of Mr. Moses Williams has been of service to this *original* writer. An importation of a few living European Moles, would not be a bad mode of supporting the assertion that *Talpa Europea* is found native in North America. It is a new mode of *establishing* animals in any country, merely to *assert* their existence. Neither of the Messrs. PEALE, of the Philadelphia Museum, has ever found this animal in this country; and certainly their ample experience and opportunities of so doing will not be denied. Who, amongst those that have devoted themselves to the research, can say, that he has ever seen the species called European Mole, inhabiting the soil of North America? It is no more an inhabitant of this country than the Kangorou, or the Cameleopard.

ropean Weazel (*Mustela Vulgaris*,) the Fetid shrew, (*sorex araneus*,) &c. are all inhabitants of North America. We are yet to learn which of his species will stand "*established*;" judging by the number of those which he has attempted to establish in other departments, and which have been overthrown, but little hope remains of *one* in twenty escaping the same fate.

It has now, I believe, been shown, that the Fauna Americana is *not* what it pretends to be. The numerous deviations of its Author from rectitude, having been distinctly and dispassionately pointed out, I take leave of the work with sincere regret that an American Naturalist should have acted in such a manner as to render the exposure of his conduct an indispensable though an unpleasant act of duty to the community at large. Before this letter is closed, a few words may be said on one or two topics, which, however, stand only in collateral relation to the principal object of this publication.

In a note to page 9, of his *Refutation*, Dr. Harlan has the following remarks :

"What renders the charges of the "critic" still more presumptuous, is the fact, that he himself stands publicly convicted of plagiarism ; for the proofs of which we need only refer to an able review by Dr. N. R. Smith, in the Philadel. Medical and Surgical Review, No. 2, vol. 2d, of a work entitled "Anatomical Investigations, by John D. Godman, M. D." In this paper are examined certain claims set forth in the "Investigations" to a few of those raræ aves, Anatomical discoveries. See further proofs in the Medical Recorder, vol. 8, p. 825. It is not to be presumed that he will attempt to escape from this stigma, by pleading ignorance of Anatomical works so well known, and so justly esteemed as those of Bell and Bichat."

One thing only is wanting to make this note a "palpable hit." That one is truth: Dr. Smith *did* write a keen and flippant article in relation to my "Anatomical Investigations." The editor of the Medical Recorder *did* bring forward some sentences which he thought proved that my ideas were not original. Dr. SMITH was uncandid and unjust, for in the preface to my "Anatomical Investigations," stands the following sentence, which he took no note of, but made his attack as if no such thing were there:

"Among the most interesting parts of these researches, is the demonstration of the *manner* in which the capsular ligaments of the great joints are formed. I am by no means anxious to claim great merit for *proving* the continuity of fasciæ, and the connexions thus produced between different parts—although BICHAT contented himself with *asserting* that the fibrous membrane may be traced into the *periosteum*. But I do expect the thanks of Anatomists and physiologists for pointing out the *mode* in which the capsular ligaments are made up from the coverings of the muscles, and thus rendering their natural conditions more intelligible and opening the way to new views of their possible situations resulting from disease or accident. I am sure of receiving the grateful applause of every unprejudiced student for having in this part of the science substituted simplicity for complexity and regularity for confusion."

Anat. Invest. Introd. p. xi.

Moreover, neither of these writers took the trouble to give a correct view of my observations, which (as explicitly stated in more than one part of my preface) were intended to show the *mode* or *manner* in which certain structures existed—not that the structures had never before been seen; to show the various points at which some textures were continuous, and not that their

continuity had never before been *asserted*. BICHAT made some general enunciations, that the fibrous membranes were continuous, by running into the periosteum or membrane surrounding the bone. Bell stated in equally general terms, that all the fibrous texture might be viewed as one system. My researches showed, not only the truth of these assertions in detail, but led to many interesting views of fibrous membranes and peculiar modifications of continuity, never pointed out by either of the above named celebrated anatomists.* The truth of these conclusions I have repeatedly demonstrated before some of the most respectable of the surgeons and physicians of this city, and am ready at any time to convince any gentleman by reference to the knife alone, and not to argument.

To conclude with Dr HARLAN; he has taken pains to sneer at my "forthcoming work on Natural History," and I am happy to state it is much nearer being laid before the public than he has any idea of, and when it is placed at their disposal, I am perfectly sure that it will give evidence of my "progressive improvement." His own book he talks of reprinting, and asserts

* A year subsequent to the publication of my researches Dr. Gerdy of Paris, published a paper containing almost precisely the same views as I had offered in relation to the muscular sheaths. Clarus of Holland, according to Meckel, has taken a view of the extension of the fascia superficialis, very similar to that given by me. Gerdy's observations were published as novel and interesting, in 1824, nor does he any where think it necessary to attribute the fruits of his observations to Bichat, because the latter has said in general terms, that the fibrous membranes are continuous.

that the first edition was not DEAD-BORN. No later than yesterday, (31st March,) the printer who owns the remainder of the first edition, and the bookseller whose shelves still groan under them, stated, that with the exception of those furnished to the subscribers, which barely defrayed the expense of printing, but TWO COPIES had been *sold*, one of which was purchased by myself. He may publish the second edition when he pleases; the *first* is restored to its rightful owner, and Dr. HARLAN has acquired a notoriety, which few men, except himself, in this community, could desire or deserve.*

He has brought forward some *errors* of mine in the Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences, in a way which is also peculiarly illustrative of his character. His remarks relative to the structure of the ear of the scalops and condylura are, in an especial manner, worthy of attention. I spent as many weeks in the fields studying the habits and manners of these two animals as Dr. Harlan was employed in getting out his whole work, and as I was very anxious to learn as far as possible from living nature, in but one instance did I kill either of

* His introduction of Cuvier's mere acknowledgment of having received the copy of the Fauna presented to him, strongly reminds us of Sheridan's formula, which he employed in answer to the authors who teased him with presents of their works, in order to win from him a commendatory letter: it ran thus—

Dear Sir—I have received your very interesting [*book, essay, poem, farce*, or whatever it might be,] and shall, no doubt, be very much delighted with it—when I have read it. With the highest respect, &c. *R. B. Sheridan.*

the animals for dissection. My remarks on them were read to the Academy on the 8th of June, 1824, and on the 9th of August, 1825, having in the interim procured another specimen for dissection, and discovered my mistake, I read a note correcting it, to the Academy, and this note is published in the Academy's Journal.* Dr. Harlan was present, heard that correction read—even made some remarks about its not being necessary to refer it to a committee, as it was a correction of a paper already published. On the Tuesday following, Dr. Harlan had the candour to come forward and read *the correction now published* in his pamphlet, as if I had never corrected my own error!

What was his plea for so doing? He had read a paper on the scalops six years ago, before I was a member of the Academy. The paper itself, is not on the files of the Academy. *What was in that paper?* All rests on Dr. Harlan's own *assertion*: and who, after knowing the facts which are here stated, can receive any thing on *the assertion* of one capable of thus acting?

He may produce *his papers*, and make them show *what he pleases*; let any man of honour refer to the minutes of the Academy of Natural Sciences, and, finding the above statements confirmed, then put faith in Dr. Harlan *if he can*.

As to any errors into which I may have fallen while engaged in pursuing my studies, I have not the slightest objection to acknowledge, and

* Page 135, Vol. V. Part I.

am always sincerely desirous to correct them. That I am *infallible*, I never pretended: that I am *honest*, I feel well assured. For proof of this, let the consistency of my conduct speak; let those who have been concerned in business with me answer; let the voice of public approbation, which has, in the short space of *five* years, given to a young, unknown, and friendless stranger, a standing seldom conferred under similar circumstances, testify whether or not I have been an ardent and undeviating votary of truth, an industrious and faithful discharger of the trusts confided to me: or whether I have ever been known to shrink from any peril of life or health, when duty bade me jeopard either? I say not this boastingly, nor in the belief that my merits have been equal to the degree of public favour which I have enjoyed: I can truly say, that my supreme desire is to become more and more worthy of it, by the correction of my errors and the improvement of my mind.

Most respectfully,

I remain your friend, &c.

JOHN D. GODMAN.

Philadelphia, April, 10th, 1826.

P. S. I have deposited Desmarest's work, in company with a marked copy of the Fauna, in a situation where they may be fairly compared by the curious. For the benefit of those who have not an opportunity of examining the books, a specimen is subjoined.

SPECIMEN OF THE FAUNA

Contrasted with the work of A. G. Desmarest.

N. B. All the articles referred to in pages 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are as servilely and as inaccurately translated as the subjoined, which are all selected from the *unacknowledged* matter.

It has been industriously urged to the public that naturalists are in the habit of appropriating to themselves the property of others without acknowledgment. To disprove this entirely, refer to Desmarest's work, and it will be seen that he gives credit with scrupulous exactness, for all that he borrows.

SECONDE FAMILLE.

INSECTIVORES, *insectivora*.

Car. Essent. Pieds courts, armés d'ongles robustes; ceux de derrière toujours à cinq doigts, ayant leur plante entièrement appuyée sur le sol; ceux de devant le plus ordinairement à cinq doigts. (Point de membranes pour voler.) Dents molaires ayant leur couronne hérissée de tubercules aigus; Canines tantôt fort longues, tantôt fort courtes.

Incisives en nombre variable. Corps couvert de poils ou de piquans; nourriture, des insectes, des racines tendres, des fruits.

Patrie, les contrées tempérées des deux continents.

1re Division. Deux longues incisives en avant, suivies d'autres incisives et de petites canines, plus courtes que les mâchelières. p. 147

Family INSECTIVORA.

Char. Essen. Feet short, armed with robust nails; hind feet always five-toed, resting on the anterior part of the sole; fore feet most generally five-toed; crowns of the molar teeth elevated into sharp tubercles; canine teeth sometimes very long, sometimes very short.

Number of incisors variable. Body covered with hair, or spines; feeding on insects, roots, and fruits.

Inhabit the temperate climates of both continents.

1st Division. Two long incisors before, followed by others, and by small canines shorter than the molars. P. 24.

XLIIe Genre.

Sorex, Linn. Erxl. Schreb.
Cuv. Lacép. Illig.

Musaraneus, Brisson.

Incisives supérieures intermédiaires à double crochet, ayant un fort éperon situé à leur talon ; incisives inférieures alongées, sortant droites de l'alvéole, et ne se recourbant qu'à l'extrémité. Fausses canines, surtout les supérieures, beaucoup plus petites que les incisives intermédiaires. Molaires à couronne large hérissée de pointes, les supérieures étant les plus grandes et ayant leur tranchant oblique ; tête très alongée ; nez prolongé et mobile ; oreilles courtes, arrondies ; yeux petits, mais visibles.

Queue plus ou moins longue tantôt tétragone, tantôt comprimée dans une partie de sa longueur, quelquefois tétretille. Corps couvert de poils fins et courts ; pieds à doigts foibles, séparés, munis d'ongles crochus non propres à fouir la terre ; mammelles au nombre de six ou de huit, tant pectorales que ventrales ; une glande sébacée sur chaque flanc, entourée des soies roides et serrées, laissant suinter une humeur grasse.

HABIT. En été se tiennent dans des trous ; en hiver pénètrent dans les grenier à foin ; vivent de vers et d'insectes ; ont une démarche lente ; répandent dans le temps du rut, une odeur as-

Genus.

Sorex, Linn. Erxleb. Schreb.
Cuv. Lacep. Illig.

Musaraneus, Brisson.

Superior intermediate incisors in form of a double hook, having a short spur situate at their base ; inferior incisors elongated, proceeding straight from the alveoles, and are recurved only at their extremity. False canine, particularly the superior, much smaller than the intermediate incisors. Molars with broad crowns, having sharp tubercles, the superior are largest and have the cutting surface oblique ; head very long ; nose elongated and moveable ; ears short and rounded ; eyes small but visible.

Tail more or less long, sometimes quadrangular, sometimes partly compressed, at others teretile. Body covered with fine short hair ; feet terminated by feeble toes, separate, furnished with hooked nails, not proper for digging the earth ; mammæ, both pectoral and ventral, to the number of six or eight ; a sebaceous gland on each flank, surrounded by stiff and compact hairs, secreting an oily liquor.

HABIT. In summer, living in holes ; in winter, penetrating hay-mows ; feeding on worms and insects ; of slow progression ; during the rutting season they diffuse a strong odour ; [hence their

sez forte, &c.

Patrie les contrées tempérées et chaudes de l'ancien continen. P. 149.

Nota. Quelques individus ont du blanc au bout de la queue, au nez, sur les pattes et, comme celui de Catesby, copié dans l'Encyclopédie autour du cou.

(1) Cette espèce nous paraît différer de la variété noire de l'écureuil capistraté, par la taille plus petite, par la douceur du poil, et parce que le nez et les oreilles ne sont pas régulièrement blancs.— Elle s'éloigne de la variété noire de l'écureuil gris par la brièveté de la queue. p. 334

HABIT. Les élans vivent en petites troupes dans les forêts marécageuses. Ils ont des allures beaucoup moins légères que celles des autres cerfs et courent ordinairement au trot. Ils vivent de bourgeons d'arbres et d'herbes. Pour paître, ils sont obligés, à cause de la brièveté de leur cou, de se mettre à genoux ou d'écartier les jambes de devant. Le rut, pour cette espèce, commence à la fin du mois d'août et dure tout le mois de septembre. Les femelles mettent bas depuis la mi-mai jusqu'à la mi-juin; la première fois, elles ne font qu'un seul petit, ensuite constamment deux et rarement trois. Les vieux élans per-

vulgar name, "pole-cat shrew."]

Inhabit temperate climates of both continents. P. 25.

Some individuals have white at the end of the tail, nose and feet, also like those of Catesby's (copied in the Encyclopædia) around the neck.

This species differs from the black variety of the *S. Capistratus* in its small size, the softness of its hair, & because its nose and ears are not regularly white. It is separated from the black variety of the Gray Squirrel by the shortness of its tail. p. 178.

HABIT. The moose live in small troops in swampy places. Their gait, which is commonly a trot, is much less active than that of other deer. They feed on the buds of trees and on herbs. When they attempt to eat from the ground, they are obliged, from the shortness of their neck, either to kneel or to separate their fore-legs. The rutting season commences with them about the end of August and continues during the month of September. The females bring forth from the middle of May, to the middle of June; the first time they produce only one young one, afterwards two, rarely three. The old moose loose

dent leurs bois en janvier et février, et les jeunes en avril et en mai. Les premiers ont leur bois nouveau à la fin de juin, et les autres au mois d'août. Durée de la vie, quinze à vingt ans.

PATRIE. L'élan appelé *Elk, Elg, Elend, Ælg, Los, Loos*, etc., par les peuples du nord de l'ancien Continent, se trouve en Europe, depuis le 53e degré de latitude, dans une partie de la Prusse, de la Pologne, de la Suède; en Finlande, en Russie, et surtout en Livonie et en Ingrie. En Asie il descend plus bas, depuis le 45e degré jusqu'au 51e, surtout en Tartarie.

En Amérique, où il est nommé *mousou* par les Algonquins, *moose* ou *moose deer* par les Anglais, et *original* par les Français, on le rencontre depuis le 44e degré jusqu'au 53e, autour des grands lacs, &c. p. 430

(1.) Le Lièvre du Groenland ou *rekalek*, qui reste entièrement blanc, même en été, avec du noir au bout des oreilles, le jeune étant d'un gris-blanchâtre. Sa femelle met bas huit petits à la fois. La nourriture de cet animal se compose principalement des herbes tendres qui croissent le long des ruisseaux dans les gorges des montagnes du Groenland.

their horns in January and February, and the young in April and May. The first have their new horns by the end of June, and the others in the month of August. Duration of life, fifteen or twenty years.

COUNTRY. The Moose Deer called *Elk, Elg, Ælg, Los, Loos*, &c. by the northern inhabitants of the ancient continent, ranges in Europe from the fifty-third to the sixty-third degree of latitude through part of Prussia Poland, Sweden, Finland, Russia, and particularly in Livonia, and in Ingrie. In Asia it descends lower, from the forty-fifth to the fifty-first degree of latitude, particularly in Tartary.

In America, where it is named *Monsoll* by the Algonquins, *Moose* or *Moose deer* by the English, and *Original* by the French, it is met with in the more northern parts of the United States, and beyond the Great Lakes.

p. 331-2.

NOTE.—Perhaps may be referred to this species also the Greenland hare, or *Rekalek*, which remains entirely white, even in summer, with black at the ends of the ears; the young being whitish-gray; the female bringing forth eight young at a time. The food of this animal consists principally of the tender herbs, which grow along the brooks on the slopes of the Greenland mountains. p. 196.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 03204219 3

ARMY
MEDICAL LIBRARY